REMARKS- General

By the above amendment, Applicants have amended the title to better emphasize what it is that is being claimed. Originally it was unclear whether Applicants were claiming an apparatus or a method the new title helps to clarify that Applicants regard a method and not an apparatus as their invention.

The Objection To The Claims Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claims 4 and 6 were previously objected to as being in improper form because of being multiple dependent claims. These claims have been replaced by claims 10 and 12, which have been rewritten to avoid a form that would classify these claims as multiple dependent claims.

The Rejection Of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C

Claims 1-4,6 were rejected as being indefinite. Claim 1, which was replaced by claim 7, had a preamble that indicated Applicants were intending to claim an apparatus, whereas Claim 3 had a preamble indicating a method, as that which was being claimed. This caused confusion as to what Applicants specifically regard as the invention. Thus, the new claims all indicate methods, due to the fact that Applicants regard the method of play and the method by which a playable game board may be derived as their invention. Applicants have no intention of trying to regard an apparatus as their invention.

It was also stated by the examiner that Claim 1 was indefinite due to the statement integers were considered *both* positive and negative. Applicants no longer refer to integers in this manner. Instead integers are now referred to as *either* positive or negative.

The Rejection Of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C 102 (b)

Claim 5 was rejected as being anticipated by Cohen (2811360). Examiner pointed out that Cohen already has a game board having integers on spaces and that rules for playing a game do not further limit an apparatus. However, claim 10, which replaced claim 5, has been written as a method claim so that the rules described therein due further limit the claim. Upon investigation by Applicants it is their belief that no prior art exists which would have anticipated the method of game play described in claim 10.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the claims are all in proper form and the claims all define patentabilty over the prior art. Therefore they submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action they respectfully solicit.

Very Repsectively,

John Thomas Arana

Him Lan

Michael Arthur Kaiser-Mistriel

-----Applicants Pro Se ------

3358 Caminito Luna Nueva

Del Mar, CA 92014

Tel 858-792-7774



Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

> Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature

Michael Althur Kaiser-Mistriel

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

 /O/ 620, 152
 858 792 - 7779

 Registration Number, if applicable
 Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.8 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.